

Boundedness properties of fermionic operators

Peter Otte
Fakultät für Mathematik
Ruhr-Universität Bochum
Germany

November 23, 2009

The fermionic second quantization operator $d\Gamma(B)$ is shown to be bounded by a power $N^{s/2}$ of the number operator N given that the operator B belongs to the r -th von Neumann-Schatten class, $s = 2(r-1)/r$. Conversely, number operator estimates for $d\Gamma(B)$ imply von Neumann-Schatten conditions on B . Quadratic creation and annihilation operators are treated as well.

1 Introduction

Operators that satisfy the canonical anti-commutation relations (CAR) are necessarily bounded. One may therefore ask what can be said about more complicated operators, say, quadratic expressions in creation and annihilation operators. Perhaps the most prominent such operator is $d\Gamma(B)$, the functor of second quantization.

Suppose, we are given a Fock representation of the CAR over a separable complex Hilbert space L . With the usual annihilation and creation operators $a(f)$ and $a^\dagger(f)$ we define for a bounded operator B on L its second quantization through

$$d\Gamma(B) := \sum_j a^\dagger(Be_j)a(\bar{e}_j) \quad (1)$$

where $\{e_j\}$ is a complete orthonormal system (ONS) in L . The details of this construction are briefly described in Section 2. We want to compare $d\Gamma(B)$ with the number

operator

$$N := d\Gamma(\mathbb{1}) = \sum_j a^\dagger(e_j)a(\bar{e}_j)$$

There are two types of theorems. The first say, roughly, the more bounded B is the smaller $d\Gamma(B)$ is. More precisely, Theorem 3.5 tells us

$$d\Gamma(B)^*d\Gamma(B) \leq \begin{cases} \|B\|_r^2 N^s + \|B\|_2^2 \mathbb{1} & 1 < r < 2 \\ \|B\|_r^2 N^s & r = 1, 2 \leq r \leq \infty \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

whenever B is in the von Neumann-Schatten class $B_r(L)$, $1 \leq r \leq \infty$, and $s = \frac{2(r-1)}{r}$. The proof is based upon a thorough analysis of (1) and uses Hölder and Cauchy-Schwarz inequalities for operators. The literature provides estimates as in (2) only for the special cases $s = 0$ ($r = 1$) and $s = 2$ ($r = \infty$). See Carey and Ruijsenaars [3] and Grosse and Langmann [5]. The N^2 bound holds also for bosons and looks like what one would intuitively expect, namely, bound a quadratic operator by another quadratic operator. However, thanks to the fermionic character, the estimates can be improved upon to yield results for all $0 \leq s \leq 2$.

In the second part, Theorem 4.1 answers the question as to how boundedness properties of $d\Gamma(B)$ affect the corresponding operator B which is only interesting for $\dim L = \infty$. Its proof uses only elementary calculations. For $s > 0$ it turns out that in a way the bound (2) is almost sharp. That is to say, an estimate with N^s implies $B \in B_{r+\varepsilon}(L)$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$. For $s = 0$ we may even forget about ε in that an estimate with $s = 0$ implies $B \in B_1(L)$ which was conjectured by Carey and Ruijsenaars [3] and Ottosen [7]. It is an open question whether one may drop ε altogether.

All theorems proved for $d\Gamma(B)$ have analogs for the quadratic annihilation and creation operators

$$\Delta(A) := \sum_j a(Ae_j)a(\bar{e}_j), \quad \Delta^+(C) := \sum_j a^\dagger(Ce_j)a^\dagger(\bar{e}_j) \quad (3)$$

Theorems 3.6 and 3.7 present number operator estimates in the spirit of (2) for $1 \leq r \leq 2$ since $\Delta(A)$ and $\Delta^+(C)$ are well-defined only for $A, C \in B_2(L)$. Hence, the N^2 estimates from the literature, see (21), are far from optimal. The proofs parallel that for $d\Gamma(B)$. Contrary to that, the converse Theorems 4.5 and 4.4 are not elementary but employ a determinant formula for fermionic Gaussians and a theorem from complex analysis. Their statement is essentially the same as for $d\Gamma(B)$ except for the case $r = 1$ which also has an $\varepsilon > 0$.

2 The CAR and second quantization

We sketch the necessary background from fermionic Fock space theory. Presentations similar in spirit can be found in [3] and [7]. We formulate the CAR for operator-valued

functionals. To this end, let L be a complex Hilbert space equipped with a conjugation $f \mapsto \bar{f}$. Throughout, we will assume L to be separable. Let further $\mathcal{F}$ be another complex Hilbert space. We call a linear map from L into the linear operators on $\mathcal{F}$

$$f \in L, f \mapsto c(f)$$

an operator-valued functional. The CAR need two such functionals, a and $a^\dagger$, which are assumed to have a common dense domain of definition $D \subset \mathcal{F}$ and

$$a(f)D \subset D, a^\dagger(f)D \subset D$$

These operators are said to give a representation of the CAR if for all $f, g \in L$ on D

$$\{a(f), a(g)\} = 0 = \{a^\dagger(f), a^\dagger(g)\} \quad (4)$$

$$\{a(f), a^\dagger(g)\} = (\bar{f}, g)\mathbb{1} \quad (5)$$

where the curly brackets denote the anti-commutator. We further require the unitarity condition

$$a(f)^* = a^\dagger(\bar{f}) \quad (6)$$

Properties (4) through (6) imply

$$(a^\dagger(f)a(\bar{f}))^2 = \|f\|^2 a^\dagger(f)a(\bar{f}) \text{ and } (a^\dagger(f)a(\bar{f}))^* = a^\dagger(f)a(\bar{f}) \quad (7)$$

In particular, $a^\dagger(f)a(\bar{f})$ is an orthogonal projection for $\|f\| = 1$ and thus

$$0 \leq a(f)^*a(f) \leq \|f\|^2, \quad 0 \leq a^\dagger(f)^*a^\dagger(f) \leq \|f\|^2 \quad (8)$$

We have the fundamental boundedness result.

Theorem 2.1. *The operators $a(f)$ and $a^\dagger(f)$ are bounded on their domain of definition and therefore extend to bounded operators on all of $\mathcal{F}$. We have*

$$\|a(f)\| = \|a^\dagger(f)\| = \|f\| \quad (9)$$

Hence, the maps $f \mapsto a(f)$, $f \mapsto a^\dagger(f)$ are continuous and injective.

In what follows, we will work exclusively within the Fock representation. It features a special vector, the vacuum $\Omega \in \mathcal{F}$, $\|\Omega\| = 1$. It is annihilated by the $a(f)$'s

$$a(f)\Omega = 0 \text{ for all } f \in L \quad (10)$$

and cyclic for the $a^\dagger(f)$'s, i.e.

$$\overline{\text{span}\{a^\dagger(f_{j_n}) \cdots a^\dagger(f_{j_1})\Omega \mid n \in \mathbb{N}_0\}} = \mathcal{F} \quad (11)$$

Consequently, $a(f)$ is called annihilation operator and $a^\dagger(f)$ creation operator. $\mathcal{F}$ is the Fock space. Because of the vacuum the Fock space has a special structure which can be described best through the n -particle spaces

$$\mathcal{F}^{(n)} := \overline{\text{span}\{a^\dagger(f_n) \cdots a^\dagger(f_1)\Omega\}}, \quad n \geq 0 \quad (12)$$

It is clear that $\mathcal{F}$ is built from these subspaces.

Theorem 2.2. *The Fock space $\mathcal{F}$ is the (completed) orthogonal sum of the n -particle spaces $\mathcal{F}^{(n)}$*

$$\mathcal{F} = \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}^{(n)} \text{ with } \mathcal{F}^{(m)} \perp \mathcal{F}^{(n)}, m \neq n$$

In order to avoid running into technical difficulties we will perform all calculations on the subspace of finite particle numbers

$$\mathcal{F}_0 := \text{span}\{\Phi \mid \Phi \in \mathcal{F}^{(n)}, n \in \mathbb{N}_0\} \quad (13)$$

Creation and annihilation operators are fully understood by Theorem 2.1. The next more complicated operators are quadratic expressions in creators and annihilators. Such quadratic operators are used in second quantization as well as in constructing central extensions of certain Lie algebras. There are different methods of introducing them. Here we define them quite straightforwardly via the following series

$$d\Gamma(B) := \sum_j a^\dagger(Be_j)a(\bar{e}_j) \quad (14)$$

$$\Delta(A) := \sum_j a(Ae_j)a(\bar{e}_j), \quad \Delta^+(C) := \sum_j a^\dagger(Ce_j)a^\dagger(\bar{e}_j) \quad (15)$$

where $\{e_j\}$ is a complete ONS in L and A, B, C are linear operators on L . The operator $d\Gamma(B)$ gives the functor of second quantization. When $\dim L < \infty$ there is no problem of convergence. For general separable L well-definedness can be shown under certain conditions at least on $\mathcal{F}_0$.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $B : L \rightarrow L$ be bounded. Then, $d\Gamma(B)$ from (14) is well-defined on $\mathcal{F}_0$ and $d\Gamma(B)^* = d\Gamma(B^*)$. When $B \geq 0$ so is $d\Gamma(B) \geq 0$. Furthermore, let $A, C : L \rightarrow L$ be Hilbert-Schmidt operators with $A^T = -A$ and $C^T = -C$ where $A^T := \bar{A}^*$ is the transpose. Then, $\Delta(A)$ and $\Delta^+(C)$ from (15) are well-defined on $\mathcal{F}_0$ and satisfy $\Delta(A)^* = \Delta^+(A^*)$.*

We will not touch upon the question as to whether the domain of definition can be enlarged. However, the conditions imposed on A, B, C are in a way necessary. For $d\Gamma(B)$ to exist on the entire one-particle space $\mathcal{F}^{(1)}$ it is necessary that B is bounded. Likewise, in order that $\Delta(A)$ exists on the entire two-particle subspace $\mathcal{F}^{(2)}$ it is necessary that A is Hilbert-Schmidt. And finally, $\Delta^+(C)$ is defined on the vacuum only if C is Hilbert-Schmidt.

We will need to know what $d\Gamma(B)$, $\Delta(A)$, and $\Delta^+(C)$ do with the n -particle spaces

$$d\Gamma(B) : \mathcal{F}^{(n)} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^{(n)}, \quad \Delta(A) : \mathcal{F}^{(n)} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^{(n-2)}, \quad \Delta^+(C) : \mathcal{F}^{(n)} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^{(n+2)} \quad (16)$$

That is why $\Delta(A)$ and $\Delta^+(C)$ are called quadratic annihilation and creation operators, respectively. $d\Gamma(B)$ preserves the number of particles. Of all the interesting algebraic properties we only need one commutator

$$[\Delta(A), \Delta^+(C)] = -4d\Gamma(CA) + 2 \operatorname{tr} AC \cdot \mathbb{1} \quad (17)$$

By taking $B = \mathbb{1}$ we obtain the particle number operator or number operator for short

$$N := d\Gamma(\mathbb{1}) = \sum_j a^\dagger(e_j) a(\bar{e}_j)$$

We will use the commutators

$$[N, a(f)] = -a(f), \quad [N, a^\dagger(f)] = a^\dagger(f)$$

As an operator on the Fock space N has a very simple structure

$$N\Phi = n\Phi, \quad \Phi \in \mathcal{F}^{(n)} \quad (18)$$

which justifies the naming. Moreover, N is essentially self-adjoint on $\mathcal{F}_0$ and $N \geq 0$. Since N as well as its functions are just multiples of the identity operator on each $\mathcal{F}^{(n)}$ they commute with number preserving operators.

3 Number operator estimates

We want to estimate $d\Gamma(B)$, $\Delta(A)$, and $\Delta^+(C)$ by the number operator N . The proofs usually rely on manipulating series, which are infinite when $\dim L = \infty$. This can always be justified by standard arguments based upon partial sums. For the sake of the presentation's clarity we will not carry this out. Furthermore, we write $B_r(L)$ for the r -th von Neumann-Schatten class and $B_r^-(L)$ for the subset of skew-symmetric operators $A^T = -A$. Finally, for $1 \leq r < \infty$ we will employ the singular value decomposition

$$A = \sum_j \mu_j(e_j, \cdot) f_j \quad (19)$$

with singular values $\mu_j \geq 0$ and ONS's $\{e_j\}$ and $\{f_j\}$. When not explicitly referring to (19) we mean $\{e_j\}$ to be any ONS.

To begin with, we cite a Jensen type inequality for operators. It goes back to Bhagwat and Subramanian [2]. See also [9] and [6].

Proposition 3.1. *Let $w_j \in \mathbb{R}$, $w_j \geq 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$. Furthermore, let $c_j : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be bounded non-negative operators on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Then, for all $1 \leq p \leq q < \infty$*

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^n w_j c_j^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq w^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n w_j c_j^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

A simple consequence is a Hölder type inequality.

Corollary 3.2. *Let $\mu_j \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mu_j \geq 0$, for $j = 1, \dots, n$. Let furthermore $c_j : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be bounded non-negative operators on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Then, for $p, q \geq 1$, $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$*

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j c_j \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n c_j^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

Proof. First of all, we rewrite the Jensen inequality in 3.1 for a special case

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j c_j \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j \right)^{1-\frac{1}{q}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j c_j^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

Without loss of generality we may assume $\mu_j > 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$. Let $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. Then,

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j c_j = \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\mu_j^p}{\mu_j^{p-1}} c_j \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j^p \right)^{1-\frac{1}{q}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\mu_j^p}{\mu_j^{(p-1)q}} c_j^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n c_j^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

which is Hölder's inequality. $\square$

This allows us to treat a very special case.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\lambda_j \geq 0$. Assume*

$$\Lambda_p := \left(\sum_j \lambda_j^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty, \text{ for } 1 \leq p < \infty \text{ or } \Lambda_\infty := \sup_j \lambda_j < \infty$$

Then, for $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ and with the understanding $\frac{1}{\infty} = 0$

$$\sum_j \lambda_j a^\dagger(e_j) a(\bar{e}_j) \leq \Lambda_p N^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

Proof. The simplest cases are $p = 1, \infty$. For $p = 1$,

$$\sum_j \lambda_j a^\dagger(e_j) a(\bar{e}_j) \leq \sum_j \lambda_j \mathbb{1}$$

because of (8). For $p = \infty$,

$$\sum_j \lambda_j a^\dagger(e_j) a(\bar{e}_j) \leq \sup_j \lambda_j \sum_j a^\dagger(e_j) a(\bar{e}_j).$$

On to the cases $1 < p < \infty$. By Hölder's inequality 3.2

$$\sum_j \lambda_j a^\dagger(e_j) a(\bar{e}_j) \leq \left(\sum_j \lambda_j^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\sum_j (a^\dagger(e_j) a(\bar{e}_j))^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} = \left(\sum_j \lambda_j^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} N^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

since, by (7), $a^\dagger(e_j) a(\bar{e}_j)$ is an orthogonal projection. $\square$

At this point the fermionic character has entered the scene via (8) and the calculations become invalid for bosons. Lemma 3.3 can be applied to general operators by dint of an operator version of Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality especially tailored to our needs. Its proof mimics one of the elementary proofs.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $a_j, b_j : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be bounded operators on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Then, for $\sigma \in \{-1, 1\}$*

$$\sigma \sum_{j,k=1}^M a_j^* b_k^* b_j a_k \leq \sum_{j,k=1}^M a_j^* b_k^* b_k a_j$$

Proof. Just look at the difference of both sides:

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \sum_{j,k} (a_j^* b_k^* b_k a_j - \sigma a_j^* b_k^* b_j a_k) &= 2 \sum_{j,k} a_j^* b_k^* (b_k a_j - \sigma b_j a_k) \\ &= \sum_{j,k} a_j^* b_k^* (\sigma^2 b_k a_j - \sigma b_j a_k) + \sum_{j,k} a_k^* b_j^* (b_j a_k - \sigma b_k a_j) \\ &= \sum_{j,k} (\sigma a_j^* b_k^* (\sigma b_k a_j - b_j a_k) + a_k^* b_j^* (b_j a_k - \sigma b_k a_j)) \\ &= \sum_{j,k} (\sigma a_j^* b_k^* - a_k^* b_j^*) (\sigma b_k a_j - b_j a_k) \\ &= \sum_{j,k} (\sigma b_k a_j - b_j a_k)^* (\sigma b_k a_j - b_j a_k) \\ &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

This implies the inequality. □

Now we can prove the first of the main theorems.

Theorem 3.5. *Let $B \in B_r(L)$, $1 \leq r \leq \infty$, and $s := \frac{2(r-1)}{r}$. Then,*

$$d\Gamma(B)^* d\Gamma(B) \leq \begin{cases} \|B\|_r^2 N^s + \|B\|_2^2 \mathbb{1} & 1 < r < 2 \\ \|B\|_r^2 N^s & r = 1, 2 \leq r \leq \infty \end{cases}$$

Proof. First of all, recall the singular value decomposition (19). The simplest case $r = 1$ follows immediately from

$$\left\| \sum_j \mu_j a^\dagger(f_j) a(\bar{e}_j) \right\| \leq \sum_j |\mu_j| = \|B\|_1$$

On to the other cases. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality 3.4,

$$\begin{aligned}
d\Gamma(B)^*d\Gamma(B) &= \sum_{j,k} a^\dagger(e_j)a(\overline{Be_j})a^\dagger(Be_k)a(\bar{e}_k) \\
&= -\sum_{j,k} a^\dagger(e_j)a^\dagger(Be_k)a(\overline{Be_j})a(\bar{e}_k) + \sum_{j,k} (Be_j, Be_k)a^\dagger(e_j)a(\bar{e}_k) \\
&\leq \sum_{j,k} \frac{\gamma_j^2}{\gamma_k^2} a^\dagger(e_j)a^\dagger(Be_k)a(\overline{Be_k})a(\bar{e}_j) + \sum_{j,k} (Be_j, Be_k)a^\dagger(e_j)a(\bar{e}_k) \\
&=: \Sigma_2 + \Sigma_1
\end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma_j \in \mathbb{R}$, $\gamma_j \neq 0$, to be chosen appropriately.

Let $1 < r < 2$. By dint of (19) and Lemma 3.3,

$$\Sigma_2 = \sum_k \frac{\mu_k^2}{\gamma_k^2} \sum_j \gamma_j^2 a^\dagger(e_j)a(\bar{e}_j) \leq \sum_k \frac{\mu_k^2}{\gamma_k^2} \left(\sum_j \gamma_j^{2p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} N^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

with $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. Upon choosing $\gamma_k = \mu_k^\alpha$ we obtain

$$\Sigma_2 \leq \sum_k \mu_k^{2(1-\alpha)} \left(\sum_j \mu_j^{2\alpha p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} N^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

We want $2(1-\alpha) = r$ and $2\alpha p = r$ which implies

$$\alpha = 1 - \frac{r}{2}, \quad p = \frac{r}{2-r}$$

with $1 < p < \infty$. Then,

$$\Sigma_2 \leq \left(\sum_j \mu_j^r \right)^{\frac{2}{r}} N^{\frac{2(r-1)}{r}}$$

after some calculations. The sum Σ_1 can be estimated by

$$\Sigma_1 = \sum_j \mu_j^2 a^\dagger(e_j)a(\bar{e}_j) \leq \sum_j \mu_j^2 \mathbb{1} = \|B\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}$$

where the right-hand side is well-defined since $\|B\|_2 \leq \|B\|_r$ for $1 \leq r \leq 2$.

For $2 \leq r < \infty$ we put $\gamma_j = 1$ and use a different order of the factors in Σ_2

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_2 &= \sum_{j,k} \mu_k^2 a^\dagger(f_k)a^\dagger(e_j)a(\bar{e}_j)a(\bar{f}_k) \\
&\leq \sum_k \mu_k^2 a^\dagger(f_k)Na(\bar{f}_k) \\
&= \sum_k \mu_k^2 a^\dagger(f_k)a(\bar{f}_k)N - \sum_k \mu_k^2 a^\dagger(f_k)a(\bar{f}_k) \\
&= N^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_k \mu_k^2 a^\dagger(f_k)a(\bar{f}_k)N^{\frac{1}{2}} - \Sigma_1
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $N^{\frac{1}{2}}$ commutes with number preserving operators. By Lemma 3.3,

$$\Sigma_2 \leq \|B\|_r^2 N^{\frac{r-2}{r}+1} - \Sigma_1$$

which proves the present case.

The case $r = \infty$ needs a bit more care since we do not avail of a singular value decomposition beforehand. Therefore, we look at the partial sums

$$d\Gamma_M(B) = \sum_{j=1}^M a^\dagger(Be_j)a(\bar{e}_j)$$

The finite dimensional restriction

$$B_M := B \mid \text{span}\{e_1, \dots, e_M\}$$

however does have a singular value decomposition, the singular values $\mu_j^{(M)}$ satisfying $\mu_j^{(M)} \leq \|B\| = \|B^*\|$ by the min-max principle. Therefore, we can prove

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j,k=1}^M a^\dagger(e_j)a^\dagger(Be_k)a(\overline{Be_k})a(\bar{e}_j) &\leq \|B\|^2 \sum_{j=1}^M a^\dagger(e_j)Na(\bar{e}_j) \\ \sum_{j,k=1}^M (Be_j, Be_k)a^\dagger(e_j)a(\bar{e}_k) &\leq \|B\|^2 \sum_{j=1}^M a^\dagger(e_j)a(\bar{e}_j) \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} d\Gamma_M(B)^* d\Gamma_M(B) &\leq \|B\|^2 \sum_{j=1}^M a^\dagger(e_j)Na(\bar{e}_j) + \|B\|^2 \sum_{j=1}^M a^\dagger(e_j)a(\bar{e}_j) \\ &= \|B\|^2 N^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^M a^\dagger(e_j)a(\bar{e}_j)N^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \|B\|^2 N^2 \end{aligned}$$

That completes the proof. $\square$

Now we turn to $\Delta(A)$ and $\Delta^+(C)$. Recall, that A and C must be Hilbert-Schmidt operators for $\Delta(A)$ and $\Delta^+(C)$ to be well-defined whence the following theorems only make sense for $1 \leq r \leq 2$. Since Theorem 3.5 contains the underlying ideas and computational details we may be rather sketchy with the proofs.

Theorem 3.6. *Let $A \in B_r^-(L)$, $1 \leq r \leq 2$, and $s := \frac{2(r-1)}{r}$. Then,*

$$\Delta(A)^* \Delta(A) \leq \begin{cases} \|A\|_1^2 \mathbb{1} & r = 1 \\ \|A\|_r^2 N^s + \|A\|_2^2 \mathbb{1} & 1 < r \leq 2 \end{cases}$$

Proof. We use the singular value decomposition (19). The case $r = 1$ is obvious. For $1 < r \leq 2$ we start, as in Theorem 3.5, from

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(A)^*\Delta(A) &= \sum_{j,k} \mu_j \mu_k a^\dagger(e_j) a^\dagger(\bar{f}_j) a(f_k) a(\bar{e}_k) \\ &= - \sum_{j,k} \mu_j \mu_k a^\dagger(e_j) a(f_k) a^\dagger(\bar{f}_j) a(\bar{e}_k) + \sum_j \mu_j^2 a^\dagger(e_j) a(\bar{e}_j)\end{aligned}$$

For $1 < r < 2$ the proof runs along the same lines as in Theorem 3.5. However, for $r = 2$ Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality 3.4 gives us

$$\Delta(A)^*\Delta(A) \leq \sum_{j,k} \mu_k^2 a^\dagger(e_j) a(f_k) a^\dagger(\bar{f}_k) a(e_j) + \sum_{j=1}^M \mu_j^2 a^\dagger(e_j) a(\bar{e}_j) \leq \|A\|_2^2 N + \|A\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}$$

That completes the proof. $\square$

The remaining operator $\Delta^+(C)$ could be treated in like manner. However, it might be insightful to use an alternative idea. Note, that generally an estimate for an operator does not yield an estimate for its adjoint.

Theorem 3.7. *Let $C \in B_r^-(L)$, $1 \leq r \leq 2$, and $s := \frac{2(r-1)}{r}$. Then,*

$$\Delta^+(C)^*\Delta^+(C) \leq \begin{cases} \|C\|_1^2 \mathbb{1} & r = 1 \\ \|C\|_r^2 N^s + 3\|C\|_2^2 \mathbb{1} & 1 < r \leq 2 \end{cases}$$

Proof. The case $r = 1$ is obvious. For $1 < r \leq 2$ we use the commutator $[\Delta, \Delta^+]$ from (17) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta^+(C)^*\Delta^+(C) &= \Delta(C^*)\Delta^+(C) \\ &= \Delta^+(C)\Delta(C^*) + [\Delta(C^*), \Delta^+(C)] \\ &= \Delta(C^*)^*\Delta(C^*) - 4d\Gamma(CC^*) + 2\operatorname{tr} C^*C \cdot \mathbb{1}\end{aligned}$$

Now use $d\Gamma(CC^*) \geq 0$ and Theorem 3.6 to complete the proof. $\square$

By using directly the defining series one could obtain better estimates, e.g. for $r = 2$

$$\Delta^+(C)^*\Delta^+(C) \leq \|C\|_2^2(N + 2\mathbb{1})$$

It is instructive to write down the concrete bounds from the literature alluded to in the introduction. Carey and Ruijsenaars have [3, 2.14, 2.24, 2.25],

$$d\Gamma(B)^*d\Gamma(B) \leq \|B\|_\infty N^2 \tag{20}$$

$$\Delta(A)^*\Delta(A) \leq \|A\|_2^2 N^2, \quad \Delta^+(C)^*\Delta^+(C) \leq \|C\|_2^2(N + 2\mathbb{1})^2 \tag{21}$$

When we assume B just to be bounded, which is possible, then the estimate (20) for $d\Gamma(B)$ is optimal. However, since $\Delta(A)$ and $\Delta^+(C)$ require A and C to be Hilbert-Schmidt operators rather than bounded operators (21) does not give the correct magnitude at all.

The estimates by Grosse and Langmann [5, App. B (b), (d)] are derived in a supersession of the CCR and CAR. Being valid for bosons and fermions alike they cannot reflect the special fermionic features used herein.

4 Converse theorems

Having seen Theorems 3.5, 3.6, and 3.7 one would first and foremost ask whether the bounds given there are sharp. Since this is not really interesting for $\dim L < \infty$ we tacitly assume $\dim L = \infty$. We start with $d\Gamma(B)$ as this is the case which can be treated by elementary means. The following statement for $r = 1$ is also mentioned, without proof, in [3, p.7].

Theorem 4.1. *Let $B \in B_\infty(L)$ and $d\Gamma(B)$ satisfy*

$$d\Gamma(B)^* d\Gamma(B) \leq \gamma_r N^s + \delta_r \mathbb{1}, \quad s = \frac{2(r-1)}{r}, \quad 1 \leq r < \infty \quad (22)$$

Then $B \in B_1(L)$ for $s = 0$. When $0 < s < 2$ then $B \in B_{r+\varepsilon}(L)$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$.

Proof. Let $\{e_j\}$ be any ONS. We start with the formula

$$(a^\dagger(e_n) \cdots a^\dagger(e_1) \Omega, d\Gamma(B) a^\dagger(e_n) \cdots a^\dagger(e_1) \Omega) = \sum_{j=1}^n (e_j, B e_j) \quad (23)$$

which along with the bound (22) implies

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^n (e_j, B e_j) \right| \leq (\gamma_r n^s + \delta_r)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (24)$$

At first, we consider the special case of self-adjoint B . Then, either $(e_j, B e_j) \geq 0$ or $(e_j, B e_j) < 0$. For the ONS at hand we may permute the indices as we wish without changing the right-hand side in (24). Hence, with some constant γ

$$\sum_{j=1}^n |(e_j, B e_j)| \leq \gamma n^{\frac{s}{2}} \quad (25)$$

which in turn shows $(e_j, B e_j) \rightarrow 0$. If this were not so there would be an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $|(e_j, B e_j)| \geq \varepsilon$ infinitely often. By the permutation argument this would contradict (25)

since $0 \leq s < 2$. Thus, we have shown that $(e_j, Be_j) \rightarrow 0$ for all ONS in L which implies B is compact (see e.g. [1]). Using in (25) the ONS from the singular value decomposition (19) we obtain

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j \leq \gamma n^{\frac{s}{2}} \quad (26)$$

where we noted $(e_j, f_j) = \pm 1$. For $s = 0$ this implies $B \in B_1(L)$. Let $s > 0$. From (26) we obtain the estimate

$$\mu_n \leq n^{\frac{s}{2}-1}$$

For the powers μ_n^r to be summable it suffices that $r(1 - \frac{s}{2}) > 1$. This is equivalent to $\frac{2(r-1)}{r} > s$ which implies the statement for self-adjoint B .

For general operators B take real and imaginary parts in (23) and note $d\Gamma(B)^* = d\Gamma(B^*)$. Applying the first part to $B + B^*$ and $i(B - B^*)$ completes the proof. $\square$

For the operators $\Delta(A)$ and $\Delta^+(C)$ we need more machinery in particular exponential functions of $\Delta^+(C)$. Fortunately, it is enough to define them on the vacuum

$$\exp(z\Delta^+(C))\Omega, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}$$

where the exponential is defined via the power series. Such expressions were studied by Robinson [8] and called fermionic Gaussians. In physics one encounters the name BCS states. Their scalar product turns out to be an entire analytic function in z .

Lemma 4.2. *Let $C \in B_2^-(L)$. Assume*

$$\Delta^+(C)^* \Delta^+(C) \leq \gamma_r N^s + \delta_r \mathbb{1}, \quad s := \frac{2(r-1)}{r} \quad (27)$$

for some $1 \leq r \leq 2$. Then, the function

$$\omega(z) := (\exp(\bar{z}\Delta^+(C))\Omega, \exp(z\Delta^+(C))\Omega)$$

is analytic on $\mathbb{C}$ and of exponential order r .

Proof. Recall from (16) that $\Delta^+(C) : \mathcal{F}^{(n)} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^{(n+2)}$ and $\mathcal{F}^{(m)} \perp \mathcal{F}^{(n)}$ for $m \neq n$. Then,

$$\omega(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{z^{2n}}{(n!)^2} (\Delta^+(C)^n \Omega, \Delta^+(C)^n \Omega)$$

Since the constants do not matter we may simplify the right-hand side of (27) to

$$\Delta^+(C)^* \Delta^+(C) \leq \gamma(N^s + \mathbb{1})$$

with $s = \frac{2(r-1)}{r}$ and some appropriate γ . Unfortunately, such estimates do not transfer generally to powers of operators. Therefore, we have to estimate by hand

$$(\Delta^+(C)^{n+1})^* \Delta^+(C)^{n+1} \leq \gamma (\Delta^+(C)^n)^* (N^s + \mathbb{1}) \Delta^+(C)^n$$

We know $\Delta^+(C)^n \Omega \in \mathcal{F}^{(2n)}$ and $N \mid \mathcal{F}^{(2n)} = 2n \mathbb{1} \mid \mathcal{F}^{(2n)}$. Hence,

$$(\Omega, (\Delta^+(C)^{n+1})^* \Delta^+(C)^{n+1} \Omega) \leq \gamma ((2n)^s + 1) (\Omega, (\Delta^+(C)^n)^* \Delta^+(C)^n \Omega)$$

Successively,

$$\begin{aligned} (\Omega, (\Delta^+(C)^{n+1})^* \Delta^+(C)^{n+1} \Omega) &\leq \gamma^{n+1} ((2n)^s + 1) ((2(n-1))^s + 1) \cdots 1 \\ &\leq \gamma^{n+1} 2^{n(s+1)} (n!)^s \end{aligned}$$

where the last estimate is for convenience. With an appropriate $\tilde{z}$,

$$|\omega(z)| \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{|z|^{2n} \gamma^{n+1} 2^{n(s+1)}}{(n!)^{2-s}} = \gamma \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\tilde{z}^{2n}}{(n!)^{\frac{2}{r}}}$$

since $2 - s = \frac{2}{r}$. This shows ω is an entire function. Since $1 \leq r \leq 2$, we may use the classical Jensen inequality to deduce

$$|\omega(z)| \leq \delta \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\tilde{z}^{nr}}{n!} \right)^{\frac{2}{r}} \leq \gamma \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\tilde{z}^{nr}}{n!} \right)^{\frac{2}{r}} = \gamma \exp \left(\frac{2}{r} \tilde{z}^r \right)$$

Hence, ω is of exponential order r . □

Lemma 4.2 pertains to Fock space properties of $\exp(z\Delta^+(C))$. On the other hand, we can express the scalar product on $\mathcal{F}$ through operators on L . See e.g. Robinson [8].

Proposition 4.3. *Let $C \in B_2^-(L)$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Then,*

$$(\exp(\bar{z}\Delta^+(C))\Omega, \exp(z\Delta^+(C))\Omega) = \det(\mathbb{1} + 4z^2 C^* C)$$

Combining Lemma 4.2 with the determinant in Proposition 4.3, hopefully, will tell us something about C . To this end, we use a corollary of Jensen's integral formula from complex analysis that relates the distribution of zeros of entire functions with their exponential order. See [4] for the statement and some refinements.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $C \in B_2^-(L)$. If $\Delta^+(C)$ satisfies the estimate*

$$\Delta^+(C)^* \Delta^+(C) \leq \gamma_r N^s + \delta_r \mathbb{1}, \quad s = \frac{2(r-1)}{r}, \quad 1 \leq r \leq 2 \quad (28)$$

then $C \in B_{r+\varepsilon}^-(L)$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$.

Proof. We use the formula from Proposition 4.3

$$\omega(z) := (\exp(\bar{z}\Delta^+(C))\Omega, \exp(z\Delta^+(C)\Omega)) = \det(\mathbb{1} + z^2 C^* C).$$

Lemma 4.2 and (28) imply ω has exponential order r . Because of Proposition 4.3 the zeros $z_j \neq 0$ of ω are given through the singular values μ_j of C

$$z_j = \pm \frac{i}{\mu_j} \text{ for all } \mu_j \neq 0$$

The theorem from complex analysis mentioned above tells us

$$2 \sum_j \mu_j^\alpha = \sum_j \frac{1}{|z_j|^\alpha} < \infty$$

for all $\alpha > r$. Hence, $C \in B_\alpha^-(L)$ for all $\alpha > r$. $\square$

Theorem 4.4 can be used for $\Delta(A)$ by the same reasoning as in Theorem 3.7.

Theorem 4.5. *Let $A \in B_2^-(L)$. If $\Delta(A)$ satisfies the estimate*

$$\Delta(A)^* \Delta(A) \leq \gamma_r N^s + \delta_r \mathbb{1}, \quad s = \frac{2(r-1)}{r}, \quad 1 \leq r \leq 2 \quad (29)$$

then $A \in B_{r+\varepsilon}^-(L)$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$.

Proof. As in Theorem 3.7 we obtain the estimate

$$\Delta^+(A^*)^* \Delta^+(A^*) \leq \gamma_r N^s + \delta_r \mathbb{1} + 2 \operatorname{tr} A^* A \cdot \mathbb{1}$$

Then, Theorem 4.4 yields the statement. $\square$

Theorems 4.1, 4.5, 4.4 naturally make one come up with the question as to whether the ε could be removed there. Except for one special case, $r = 1$ in Theorem 3.5, this is an open problem. If we could get rid of ε the bounds in Section 3 would become sharp, at least asymptotically. That this is so was conjectured by Carey and Ruijsenaars [3] and Ottesen [7] for the case $r = 1$. Our proofs as they stand cannot be generalized. The estimate of the singular values in Theorem 4.1 is sharp as show simple examples. As to Theorem 4.4 there are entire functions of exponential order 1 whose zeros cannot be summed up with exponent 1, e.g. $f(z) = \sin(z)$. Hence, although the operators

$$d\Gamma(B) = \sum_j \frac{1}{j} a^\dagger(f_j) a(\bar{e}_j), \quad \Delta^+(C) = \sum_j \frac{1}{j} a^\dagger(f_j) a^\dagger(\bar{e}_j)$$

look quite similar we only know the first to be unbounded whereas the latter's unbound-
edness remains an open problem.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the research network SFB TR 12 – ‘Symmetries and Universality in Mesoscopic Systems’ of the German Research Foundation (DFG).

References

- [1] D. Bakić and B. Guljaš. Which operators approximately annihilate orthonormal bases? *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)*, 64(3-4):601–607, 1998.
- [2] K. V. Bhagwat and R. Subramanian. Inequalities between means of positive operators. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 83(3):393–401, 1978.
- [3] A. L. Carey and S. N. M. Ruijsenaars. On fermion gauge groups, current algebras and Kac-Moody algebras. *Acta Appl. Math.*, 10(1):1–86, 1987.
- [4] S. Yu. Favorov. Zero sets of entire functions of exponential type with additional conditions on the real line. *Algebra i Analiz*, 20(1):138–145, 2008.
- [5] H. Grosse and E. Langmann. A supersversion of quasifree second quantization. I. Charged particles. *J. Math. Phys.*, 33(3):1032–1046, 1992.
- [6] B. Mond and J. E. Pečarić. Remarks on Jensen’s inequality for operator convex functions. *Ann. Univ. Mariae Curie-Skłodowska Sect. A*, 47:96–103, 1993.
- [7] J. T. Ottesen. *Infinite-dimensional groups and algebras in quantum physics*, volume 27 of *Lecture Notes in Physics. New Series m: Monographs*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995.
- [8] P. L. Robinson. Fermionic Gaussians. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 118(3):543–554, 1995.
- [9] H. L. Vasudeva and Mandeep Singh. Weighted power means of operators. *Rend. Semin. Mat. Univ. Politec. Torino*, 66(2):131–136, 2008.